



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/674,701 | 09/30/2003 | Roger Petrus Gerebern Vandecruys | JAB-1467 CONT | 4563 |

27777 7590 06/01/2006

PHILIP S. JOHNSON
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER

YOUNG, MICAH PAUL

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1618

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/674,701 | Applicant(s) VANDECROUYS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Micah-Paul Young | Art Unit 1618 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment of Papers Received: Petition Decision dated 3/31/06, Amendment/Response dated 1/9/06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 20,21,25,26 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rickey et al (USPN 5,792,477 hereafter '477). The claims are drawn to a solid formulation comprising 9-hydroxy risperidone, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, and one or more hydrophilic polymers.

3. The '477 patent teaches a microparticle formulation comprising biodegradable polymers such as poly-lactic acids and 9-hydroxy risperidone, along with other hydrophilic polymers such as polyvinyl pyrrolidone, and carboxymethylcellulose (col. 5, lin. 29-56; col. 13, lin. 60-col. 14, lin. 11). The hydrophilic polymers are present in an amount from 0.5-2% wt. (*Ibid.*). The reference discloses a method for the delivery of the microparticles to a patient (col. 7, lin. 35-43). These disclosures render the claims anticipated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined disclosures of Rickey et al (USPN 5,792,477 hereafter '477) and Shimizu et al (USPN 5,824,339 hereafter '339). The claims are drawn to a formulation comprising 9-hydroxy risperidone, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, and one or more hydrophilic polymers, wherein the polymers are hydroxypropylcellulose polymers.

7. As discussed above the '477 patent teaches a solid microparticle formulation comprising 9-hydroxy risperidone and hydrophilic polymers. These hydrophilic polymers include cellulosic polymers along with polyvinylpyrrolidone and other well-known polymers. The reference however is silent to the inclusion the specific cellulosic polymers recited by the claims.

8. The '339 reference discloses antibiotics in combination with various water-soluble polymers (col. 5, lin. 9-35). The hydrophilic polymers include hydroxypropylcellulose with a viscosity between 1-150,000 cps (col. 4, lin. 55-60), and hydroxypropylmethylcellulose with a viscosity between 1-40,000 centistokes (col. 5, lin. 1-8). The formulation can comprise both celluloses at prescribed ratios (col. 6, lin. 52 – 62), in addition to further excipients such as starches and other well-known excipients. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

Art Unit: 1618

motivated to include the viscous hydroxypropyl cellulose polymers of the '339 reference in order to improve the stability of the microparticle formulation. Further since both reference comprise similar components such as carboxymethylcellulose and other hydrophilic polymers, an artisan of ordinary skill would be able to simply substitute the viscous polymers in order to improve the stability.

9. With these things in mind it would have been obvious to combine the highly viscous polymers of the '339 patent with the formulation of the '477 patent in order to provide stability and a controlled release to the microparticles. The '447 suggests the inclusion of carboxymethylcellulose, while the '339 patent discloses the use of either carboxymethylcellulose or hydroxypropylcellulose polymers. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings with an expected result of a control releasing formulation of a solid dosage form.

10. Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined disclosures of Rickey et al (USPN 5,792,477 hereafter '477) and Yajima et al (USPN 5,972,373 hereafter '373). The claims are drawn to a controlled release formulation comprising 9-hydroxyrisperidone and hydrophilic polymers.

11. As discussed above the '477 patent discloses a formulation comprising 9-hydroxyrisperidone and various hydrophilic polymers. The reference however is lacking a disclosure of the particular polymers of applicant.

12. The '373 patent discloses a taste masking formulation for various antibiotic agents (abstract). The formulation comprises hydrophilic polymers including hydroxypropylcellulose, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose, pregelatinized starch, and cyclodextrins (col. 3, lin. 13 – 56).

Art Unit: 1618

Since similar antibiotics are masked by this formulation (col. 2, lin. 38-48), a skilled artisan would have been motivated to use the polymers of the '373 patent in order to impart stability and taste masking properties to the presentation.

13. Regarding claims that recite specific ratios and concentrations, it is the position of the examiner that such limitations do not impart patentability on the claims, since they merely represent an optimize range that can be determined through routine experimentation. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *See In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

14. Furthermore the claims differ from the reference by reciting various concentrations of the active ingredient(s). However, the preparation of various cosmetic compositions having various amounts of the active is within the level of skill of one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. It has also been held that the mere selection of proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. *See In re Russell*, 439 F.2d 1228 169 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1971).

15. With these things in mind it would have been within the level of skill in the art to combine the antibiotic of '477 with the hydrophilic polymers of '373 in order to impart stability and taste masking properties on the formulation. A skilled artisan would make this combination with an expected result of a stable, pleasantly tasting antibiotic formulation.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However it remains the position of the Examiner that the

Art Unit: 1618

supporting references in combination would obviate the claims. The claims are drawn broadly to a solid formulation comprising a compound and a hydrophilic polymer. The supporting references provide the specific polymers and their viscosities. The supporting references establish that combining these components provides no unexpected result. Applicant is invited to provide any unexpected results from the combination of the instant claims. Each reference discloses the formation of microparticles to be delivered in some form to a patient, either in a tablet or injectable formulation. For these reasons the claims remain obviated by the supporting references in combination.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1618

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Micah-Paul Young whose telephone number is 571-272-0608.


The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Micah-Paul Young
Examiner
Art Unit 1618


MP Young


MICHAEL G. HARTLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER